

REMARKS

In his final rejection, the Examiner has indicated that Claims 7, 8, and 10-16 are allowed, Claims 1, 9, and 17 are rejected, that Claims 2-6 are withdrawn, and that Claim 9 would be allowable if written in independent form. Applicant appreciates the telephone interview with applicant's attorney on July 28, 2005. During the telephone interview, Claim 17 was reviewed and it was determined that Claim 17 was actually prior Claim 9 as originally indicated would be allowable if written in independent form, so would be allowed. Claims 2-6 were discussed and it was indicated that since Claims 2-6 depended from allowed Claim 7 (Claim 2 depends from Claim 7 with the remaining claims depending from Claim 2 or intermediate claims), Claims 2-6 would be allowed.

Rejected Claim 1 was also discussed and the Examiner explained his position that he did not believe the language previously added to Claim 1, i.e., "wherein the quench box has only . . . two manways" adequately limited the number of manways in the quench box to two in view of the "comprising" language in the claim, particularly where other alternative language, such as "wherein the quench box 'consists' of only . . . two manways" would more clearly limit the claim. However, since this is a Final Rejection, the Examiner indicated he would not enter such an amendment to Claim 1 at this time. Therefore, Applicant cancels rejected Claims 1 and 9.

The amendments to Claims 7 and 17 correct an error in spelling.

Please charge any fees due or credit any overpayments to deposit account no. 20-0100 of the undersigned.

Respectfully,

THORPE NORTH & WESTERN



Robert R. Mallinckrodt
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,565
Customer No. 20,115

July 29, 2005
Salt Lake City, Utah